DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 464 380 EA 031 524

AUTHOR	Murphy, Joseph
TITLE	Re-Culturing the Profession of Educational Leadership: New Blueprints.
INSTITUTION	University Council for Educational Administration.
SPONS AGENCY	National Policy Board for Educational Administration, Fairfax, VA.; Johnson Foundation, Inc., Racine, WI.
PUB DATE	2001-09-00
NOTE	15p.; Paper commissioned for the Meeting of the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation (1st, Racine, WI, September 19-21, 2001).
PUB TYPE	Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Education; Educational Development; Educational Practices; Educational Principles; Elementary Secondary Education; *Leadership; *Professional Development
IDENTIFIERS	Reform Efforts

ABSTRACT

As the field of school administration gravitated toward conceptions of leadership based on business management and social-science research, its educational roots atrophied over the course of the 20th century. This paper makes the case for a new conceptual foundation for the profession and presents a possible framework for recasting the concept of leadership. The new foundation is anchored in three key concepts: school improvement, democratic community, and social justice. School leadership is cast in terms of three metaphors: moral steward, educator, and community leader. The "Principle of Correspondence" is presented as a synthesizing paradigm that promotes finding a principle that provides correspondence between value-carrying dimensions of a profession. It focuses on defining aims rather than engendering academic foment or parsing out administrative activities. It should act as an intellectual magnet to pull work together and guide it in certain directions, be informed by and help organize work and ideas, promote the development of a body of ideas and concepts that define school administration as an applied field, engender productive dialogue and exchange between different points of view, and establish a framework that ensures that the standard for what is taught is related to valued ends. (Contains 43 references.) (RT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 464 380

Re-culturing the Profession of Educational Leadership: New Blueprints

Joseph Murphy, Ph. D.

Paper Commissioned for the first meeting of the
National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation

"Ensuring Universities' Capacity to Prepare Learning Focused Leadership"
Wingspread Conference Center, Racine, Wisconsin
September 19-21, 2001

Sponsored by

University Council for Educational Administration
National Policy Board for Educational Administration
and
The Johnson Foundation

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

C. L. Willis

1

EA 031574

Reculturing the Profession of Educational Leadership: New Blueprints

Introduction

The Theme

Over the years, a number of colleagues have provided reviews of the profession in which they have taken stock of the field of school administration with the aim of helping us explore our development, locate the profession in the larger world of education ideas and practice, and offer insights about alternative futures (see for example, Boyan, 1981; Boyd & Crowson, 1981; Campbell, Fleming, Newell, & Bennion, 1987; Erickson, 1977, 1979; Griffiths, 1988; March, 1978). During the last dozen years, some of my own work has attended to this stock taking and directing function. Indeed, it is that work that provides the architecture for the forthcoming NSSE yearbook devoted to Educational Leadership (Murphy, in press) in general and the section on "reculturing the profession" in particular (Murphy, 1999). While elsewhere I have spent considerable space unpacking the historical foundations of school administration (Murphy, 1992), the spotlight in the forthcoming NSSE volume is on informing the development of the next era of the profession. This paper was written as a chapter for the NSSE yearbook devoted to Educational Leadership (Murphy, in press).

Thesis

The thesis of the paper runs as follows:

(1) For some time now, the profession has been marked by considerable ferment as it has struggled to locate itself in a post-behavioral science era. During this era of turmoil, the historical foundations of the profession have been thrown into question, especially the legitimacy of the knowledge base supporting school administration and the appropriateness of programs for preparing school leaders.

(2) A broad cut through the work of scholars in the field during this period provides some insights about new scaffolding on which to rebuild the profession. To be sure, the period has been marked by dysfunctional accommodations and limited vision about alternative futures. Nonetheless, a careful reading of the work of colleagues across the intellectual spectrum offers up a framework for rethinking school administration. Specifically, a powerful combination of three key concepts that provide new anchors for the profession are visible—school improvement, democratic community, and social justice.

(3) Each of these anchors individually, and all three collectively, offer great promise for repositioning the profession of school administration. Together, they channel the work of colleagues into collective action around a coherent framework for school administration. Indeed, as noted earlier, the entire volume is predicated on this proposition. Part 3 of the book is given over to an exploration of each of these three new groundings while parts 4 and 5 examine what such a reculturing will mean for research, policy, and practice in educational leadership.

Overview

This paper[1] is devoted to two issues. First, I make the case for the new foundation for the profession noted above. I begin by reviewing the methods traditionally used to define the profession and its work. I suggest that these strategies will not prove successful in reculturing school leadership and argue for an alternative method to locate an appropriate portal to the future. In so doing, I retrace the steps that led to a new perspective, one that revolves around the powerful unifying concepts of social justice, democratic community, and school improvement.

Second, based on this alternative way of framing the profession, I present one framework for recasting the concept of leadership. In so doing, school leadership is defined in terms of three metaphors: moral steward, educator, and community builder.

Reculturing: The Bankruptcy of Traditional Ways of Doing Business

The Traditions

To get us started, it is necessary to lay out the traditional possibilities for rethinking the concept of school administration as a profession in general and the design of preparation and development of school leaders in particular. While there are a variety of ways to think about this task, let me present a roadmap that encompasses the four most well-traveled pathways: Primacy of mental discipline (processes), primacy of the administrator (roles, functions, tasks), primacy of content (knowledge), and primacy of method.

A focus on mental discipline posits that particular content is less important than the development of processes or metacognitive skills. With deep roots in the dominant seventeenth and eighteenth centuries understandings of learning, a mental discipline perspective views content as a vehicle for the development of important faculties such as observation, judgment, and perception. In here one might include work on: (1) processes—such as the early work of Griffiths on administration as decision making or the more recent research of Leithwood on administration as problem solving; (2) thinking/reflection—such as the scholarship of Ann Hart, Chuck Kerchner, and Karen Osterman and Robert Kottkamp; and, at least for our purposes here, (3) ethics and values—such as the writings of Jerry Starratt and Lynn Beck. In the practice wing of the professional edifice, one need look no further than to the quite popular assessment centers of the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the National Association of Elementary School Principals to see the vitality of the mental discipline approach grounding the profession.

Highlighting the role of the administrator privileges issues relating to the activities of school leaders. A review of the literature reveals that the key constructs here are: (1) roles—such as the work of Arthur Blumberg, Larry Cuban, Susan Moor Johnson, and Richard Wallace on the superintendency; Hartzell, Williams, and Nelson and Catherine Marshall on the assistant principalship; Terry Deal and Kent Peterson, Ellen Goldring and Sharon Rallis, Phil Hallinger and Charlie Hausman, Ann Hart and Paul Bredeson, Karen Seashore Louis, Nona Prestine, Tom Sergiovanni and a host of others on the principalship; (2) functions—such as work on Matha McCarthy, Nina Cambron-McCabe, and S. B. Thomason on law, Jim Guthrie and David Monk and Marge Plecki on finance, and Phil Young and William Castetter in the personnel area; and (3) tasks—such as the writings of John Daresh and Tom Sergiovanni and Jerry Starratt on supervising employees.

Spotlighting content places knowledge at the center of the administrative stage. Historically, this approach has two epistemological axes—discipline-based (or technical)

knowledge and practice-based knowledge, axes which are regularly portrayed as being under considerable tension. Reform efforts afoot in the current era of ferment tend to spotlight this knowledge sector of our four-part framework. Work in the technical or academic domain is of three types: (1) struggles over the meaning and viability of knowledge-based foundations for the profession; (2) attempts to widen the traditional knowledge domains that define school administration, e.g., the infusion of ethics and values, cultural and gender-based perspectives, and critical viewpoints into the profession; and (3) analyses and initiatives to either recast the knowledge base of the field for the future (e.g. the recent NPBEA and UCEA curriculum development work) or establish a new discipline-based ground for the profession (e.g., policy analysis). In the practice domain, one main thrust has been the religitimization of the craft aspects of the profession, including the recognition of ideas such as "stories" that came under heavy critique during the scientific era. A second thrust has been the work of scholars like Paula Silver and Ed Bridges and Phil Hallinger to codify and make more systematic what has traditionally been available in only an ad hoc fashion.

Finally, the field of school administration can be conceptualized in terms of methods. As with the other three areas, methods can then be viewed as a strategy for redefining the meaning of school administration. As was the case with the emphasis on mental discipline, privileging methods pull processes into the foreground while often, but not always, pushing other issues into the background. One line of work in this area has focused on efforts to strengthen methods in educational administration research. In addition, much of the work in school administration in this domain has been in the service of developing a more robust portfolio of designs—in both the research and application domains. On the issue of a more robust portfolio of research strategies, the work of qualitative methodologists such as Yvonna Lincoln and of scholars employing non-traditional approaches is most noteworthy. In the application domain, the scholarship of Bridges and Hallinger on problem-based learning is becoming increasingly woven into the profession, as are a renewed emphasis on case studies and a bundle of strategies such as journal writing, novels, films, reflective essays, and autobiographies.

An Inadequate Guide

The central dilemma that we face is that none of the four avenues that ground the profession is likely to provide the appropriate scaffolding for reculturing the profession. Let me show how this is the case by examining how the most popular line of work on redefining school administration—the development of a more robust body of scholarship—is unlikely to carry us to the next phase of development. Similar cases can be made for the other three elements of the framework as well

A Single Break-Out Point

The central problem is that our fascination with building the academic infrastructure of school administration has produced some serious distortions in what is primarily an applied field. It is difficult to see how renewed vigor in this area will do much to extract us from these difficulties. As a matter of fact, a case can be made that such efforts may simply exacerbate existing problems and deepen the fissures that mark the profession. To begin with, since academic knowledge is largely the purview of professors, the focus on technical knowledge places the university in the center of the field—a sort of pre-Copernican worldview of the

profession. This perspective also creates serious reference misalignment. It strongly suggests that the primary reference group for academics is other professors.

There are other reasons to believe that a primary focus on content, especially technical knowledge, is as likely to reinforce problems as it is to expose the foundations for reculturing school administration. On the one hand, if one believes that the best predictor of future behavior is past behavior, then a content-based attack on the problems of ferment and fragmentation will probably solidify the orientation of professors to the various academic disciplines rather than to the field of school administration with its problems and challenges. The quest for deeper and more robust knowledge becomes little more than academic trophy hunting. Under this scenario, new content, no matter how appealing the topics, is no more likely to improve the profession than did the content being replaced. I believe that there is ample evidence of this dynamic already in the "more appropriate" knowledge areas being mined today (e.g. ethics, social context, critical theory, and so forth).

Keeping the spotlight focused on academic knowledge also leads to, or at least reinforces, the belief that better theories will be the savior of administrative practice. That is, if we can just develop better theories, the educational world would be a better place, educational administration programs would be stronger, and graduates would be more effective leaders. The problem is that the development of better, or more refined, or more elegant theories in and of itself will have almost no impact on the practice of school administration. Such work has not had much impact in the past, it is not having much influence now, and it is unlikely to be more efficacious in the future. Worse, this work often reinforces the centrality of the university, makes knowledge an end rather than a means for improvement, privileges knowledge over values, and, quite frankly, diverts energy from other much more needed work.

All of this has led us to spend considerable time talking about constructing what can only be labeled charitably as "the bridge to nowhere." That is, having made academic knowledge the coin of the realm and seeing its inability to penetrate the world of schooling, we have been forced to develop strategies to try to transport knowledge from the academic to the practice community. The focus is on the development of knowledge in one place and the transfer of it to another. I think that if we have learned anything over the last 30 years, it is that this bridge metaphor is largely inappropriate. When you examine this issue in a clear light, you really do not see much interest in actually doing the work necessary to build this bridge. People on both sides of the river seem to be fairly content where they are. What's more, if through some type of magic the bridge were ever constructed, I do not think it would end up carrying much traffic. Trying to link theory and practice in school administration has been for the last 30 years a little like attempting to start a car with a dead battery. The odds are fairly long that the engine will ever turn over.

A related case can also be developed against making practice-based knowledge the gold standard for reculturing the profession. The central problem here is that the practice of educational leadership has very little to do with either education or leadership. Thus weaving together threads from practice to form a post-theory tapestry of school administration is a very questionable idea. A number of analysts have concluded that schools are organized and managed as if we had no knowledge of either student learning or the needs of professional adults. Others have discovered that the schools are administered in ways such that educational goals are undermined and learning is hindered, especially for lower ability students. Still others have built a fairly strong case over the last 70 years that the profession has drawn energy almost exclusively from the taproot of management and the ideology of corporate America. The

message, to perhaps state the obvious, is that this practice knowledge is not exactly the raw material from which to build a future for the profession.

The point in this section is not to dismiss knowledge as unimportant. Scientific inquiry, scholarly insights, and craft knowledge will offer useful substance in the process of reculturing school administration. As a matter of fact, we will not be able to create a future without these critical components. What I am suggesting, however, is that if we expect a concerted effort primarily on this front to provide sufficient material to construct a new profession, we will likely be disappointed. Worse, over-reliance on the cultivation of knowledge, either in the academic or the practice vineyards, is likely to exacerbate deeply rooted problems in the profession. And what is true for a singular focus on content holds, I argue, for methods, processes, and administrator roles and functions.

A Collective Attack

If none of the four traditional ways we have thought about the profession looks promising as a vehicle to help us recast our understanding of school administration, will not continued progress on all fronts guide us in our efforts? It is possible, but I think not likely. The issue of dominance never really fades away, although it is possible to reenvision the evolution of productive tension among the ideas that in turn fosters cycles of creative dialogue and action. While this is possible, the history of the field would, I think, encourage us to not be too sanguine about this collective strategy. There is little room to expect anything similar to a common platform to result form this approach. Absent that, it seems more likely that we will have continued fragmentation and the absence of synergy necessary for the profession to progress to the next stage of development.

In addition, the more recent evidence on this strategy—what Donmoyer (1999) calls the "big tent" (p. 30) philosophy and what Campbell and his colleagues (1987) characterize as "paradigm enlargement" (p. 209)—is not encouraging either. After 15 years or more of following this approach, school administration today looks a good deal like Weick's (1976) famous tilted soccer field or, perhaps even more aptly, like the typical American high school of the last half of the twentieth century, what Powell, Farrar, and Cohen (1985) labeled "shopping malls." We have responded to the challenges of purpose and development largely by ignoring them, at least by failing to thoughtfully grapple with them. We have done exactly what high schools have done; we have crated a plethora of specialty shops for everyone who wants to move into the big tent. And like the players and fans in Weiks' soccer game, we have allowed everyone to establish his or her own rules and his or her own definitions of success. Everyone has his or her own booth in the tent and goes about his or her business with very few tethers to anything like a core, with little concern for coherence, largely unencumbered by mutually forged benchmarks and standards, with considerable thoughtfulness—or at least politeness—and with very little real conflict. Autonomy and civility rule. School administration as a profession stagnates.

Doing Nothing

Here is the question that now surfaces. If traditional frameworks that define the field offer insufficient force—either on a strategy-by-strategy or on a collective basis—to reculture the profession, then where do we turn? Before moving on to that which I believe can help us move forward, let me review a third possibility that is seen increasingly in the literature. In short, it

would be to dismiss the notion that common scaffolding for the profession is a worthwhile idea. Certainly the discussion of a core for reculturing school administration will cause consternation if not alarm among some colleagues. The very concept of a core carries the potential to privilege certain ideas while marginalizing others. Let me acknowledge at the outset that this is a quite legitimate concern and one that we had to struggle to address in developing the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium's *Standards for School Leaders*. Yet the concern is not sufficient, at least from where I sit, to negate action. I believe that this third avenue of response—rejection of the possibility of an alternative framework—is likely to lead to, to borrow a phrase from Evers and Lakomski (1996a), "skepticism and enfeebling relativism" (p. 342).

I would suggest that recognizing that all knowledge and action are political does not mean that all knowledge and action are equal. I believe that Willower (1998) provides the high ground here when he reminds us that "some constructions of reality are better than others" (p. 450). I would go further and suggest that in the world of ideas, diversity is not in and of itself a virtue. More important, I would encourage us to be skeptical of the viewpoint that a common framework for redefining the profession will only advantage some ideas and marginalize others. Centers can empower as well as constrain.

A New Perspective

So far, I have argued that doing nothing—giving up or resisting the search for a directing future for the profession—is not a wise idea, nor is it necessary to protect the interests of scholars with diverse viewpoints. I have also suggested that a concerted effort to move to a new era for school administration by focusing on any given element of extant framework we use to define ourselves, i.e., the production of new theoretical knowledge, will not likely serve us well either. Finally, I maintained that an eclectic or big tent strategy in this era of ferment is equally as likely to be ribboned with problems as to be marked with benefits. What is left? It seems to me that one answer lies in the work of Herbert Kliebard (1995). Building on the work of Dewey, Kliebard introduces a patched-together concept called "principle of correspondence" (p. 57). It is his way of describing Dewey's efforts to recast problems away from selecting among alternatives and toward "the critical problem of finding a principle" (p. 57) that provides correspondence between valued dimensions of a profession. For me, it provides a way of recasting a dilemma that by definition is not solvable into a problem that is, or at least may be, successfully attacked. In effect, it provides a fifth way of defining the profession—a "synthesizing paradigm" (Boyan, 1981, p. 10) that focuses on defining aims rather than stirring the academic caldron or parsing out administrative activities.

How can we frame a principle of correspondence to meet our needs? There is a good deal of open space here. However, it probably is desirable to hold any principle of correspondence to the following seven standards:

1. It should acknowledge and respect the diversity of work afoot in educational administration yet exercise sufficient magnetic force—or what Boyan (1981) refers to as "intellectual magnetism" (p. 12)—to pull much of that work in certain directions.
2. It should be informed by and help organize the labor and the ideas from the current era of ferment.
3. It should promote the development of a body of ideas and concepts that define school administration as an applied field.

4. It should provide hope for fusing the enduring dualisms described by Campbell and his colleagues (1987) that have bedeviled the profession for so long (e.g., knowledge vs. values, academic knowledge vs. practice knowledge) and should, to quote from Evers and Lakomski (1996a) provide a "powerful touchstone for adjudicating rival approaches to administrative research (p. 343).
5. It should provide a crucible where civility among shop merchants in the big tent gives way to productive dialogue and exchange.
6. It should be clear about the outcomes upon which to forge a redefined profession of school administration; in other words, it should provide the vehicle for linking the profession to valued outcomes.

That is:

7. It should establish a framework that ensures that the "standard for what is taught lies not with bodies of subject matter" (Kliebard, 1995, p. 72) but with valued ends.

Where might we find such a principle of correspondence? A number of thoughtful colleagues have provided frameworks that offer the potential to meet Kliebard's (1995) criterion of "reconstructing the questions as to present new [alternatives]" (p.49) and that fit at least some of the standards outlined above. My purpose here is not to develop a comprehensive listing. Nor is it to evaluate each of the examples. The limited objective is simply to show how some colleagues in the profession have made progress in helping us exit the current era of turmoil by employing strategies that fit into the broad category of "principle of correspondence."

A number of such efforts stand out. At least four with a knowledge-base tincture deserve mention. To begin with, there is the work of Griffiths (1995, 1997) on what he refers to as "theoretical pluralism" (1997, p. 371), but theoretical pluralism that is intrinsically yoked to problems of practice. There is also the scholarship of Willower (1996) on nuturalistic philosophy or nuturalistic pragmatism. A related line of work, which might be best labeled "pragmatism", has been developed by Hoy (1996). The scholarship of Evers and Lakomski (1996b) on "developing a systematic new science of administration" (p. 379)—what they describe as "nuturalistc coherentism" (p. 385)—is a fourth example of a principle of correspondence at work. The most important example with a practice focus is the work of Bridges and Hallinger (1992, 1995) on problem-based learning. Ideas with feet in both the academic and practice camps have been provided by Donmoyer (1999), who introduces the concept of "utilitarianism" as a potential way to redefine debate and action in the profession and by Murphy (1992), who discusses a "dialectic" (p. 67) strategy.

Again, my purpose here is simply to reveal how colleagues have begun doing some of the heavy lifting to help us in the process of conceptualizing new ways to think about reculturing school administration. Individually and collectively, they offer bundles of ideas and sets of elements –ideas such as a problem-solving focus, emphasis on the concrete, highlighting the sense of possibilities—that offer real promise to the profession.

At the same time, each of the approaches listed above falls short when measured against the standards for a principle of correspondence presented above. In addition, with the possible exception of the latter two, each remains too closely associated with one or the other of the traditional ways in which we have framed the profession, in nearly every case with a focus on knowledge production. If we take a step back, I think that we can build on these and other breakout ideas to move a little closer to our goal.

The question at hand is as follows: When we layer knowledge about the well-known shortcomings of the profession onto understandings developing in the current era of ferment and

then apply the notion of a principle of correspondence with its imbedded standards, what emerges? It seems to me that three powerful synthetic paradigms become visible: social justice, school improvement, and democratic community. Each of these offers the potential to capture many of the benefits revealed by the standards and, in the process, to borrow a phrase from Fullan, to reculture school administration. Collectively, they offer a robust model to overhaul the profession.

The next three papers unpack each of these synthetic models. In each case, the authors explore what featuring a particular framework might mean for the profession of school administration. Authors of later papers investigate what anchoring school administration on concepts such as social justice, democratic community, and school improvement implies for school leadership as an applied discipline. Before we proceed to these analyses, however, it is helpful to examine the changing definition of "leadership" itself in a profession built on the foundations of social justices, school improvement, and democratic community. We turn to that assignment below.

New Foundations: New Understandings of Leadership

In this section, three metaphors are used to sketch a portrait of leadership for the recultured profession described earlier—moral steward, educator, and community builder. In so doing, I acknowledge a debt to Sergiovanni (1991) who reminds us that "changing our metaphors is an important prerequisite for developing a new theory of management and a new leadership practice" (p. 69).

Moral Steward

The metaphor of the administrator as moral steward takes on many forms. At its core is one fundamental belief, however: that "the new science of administration will be a science with values and of values" (T. Greenfield, 1988, p. 155). Moral leadership acknowledges that "values and value judgments are the central elements in the selection, extension, and day-to-day realization of educational purpose" (Harlow, 1962, p. 67).

As moral stewards, school leaders will be much more heavily invested in "purpose-defining" (Harlow, 1962, p. 61) activities and in "reflective analysis and...active intervention" (Bates, 1984, p. 268) than simply in managing existing arrangements. This means that persons wishing to impact society as school leaders must be directed by a powerful portfolio of beliefs and values anchored in issues such as justice, community, and schools that function for all children and youth. They must maintain a critical capacity and foster a sense of possibilities, and bring to their enterprise a certain passion that affects others deeply" (Sergiovanni, 1991, p. 334). They must view their task more as a mission than a job; "they must develop strong commitments to important things and model them persuasively" (Moorman, 1990, p. 101); "the task of the leader is to create a moral order that bonds both leader and followers to a set of shared values and beliefs" (Sergiovanni, 1989b, p. 34). Therefore, moral leadership means that tomorrow's school administrators must use their personal platform to "engage participants in the organization and the community in reinterpreting and placing new priorities on guiding values for education" (Moorman, 1990, p. 98) and in reconstructing "structures so that they celebrate the intended educational purposes of the school community" (Bates, 1984, p. 268).

At a quite practical and tangible level, leadership as moral stewardship means seeing the moral—the ethical and justice—implications of the thousand daily decisions made by each

school administrator (Beck & Murphy, 1998). In its most comprehensive and concrete form it means building an ethical school (Starratt, 1991). While meeting the "moral imperative to provide real learning opportunities to the whole of the student population" (Osin & Lesgold, 1996, p. 621).

Educator

As we have discussed in numerous venues, the educational roots of the profession of school administration atrophied over the course of the 20th Century as the field gravitated toward conceptions of leadership based on scientific images of business management and social science research. In the recultured profession proffered in this volume, there is an explicit acknowledgement of the "pathology of such an approach to educational administration" (Bates, 1984, p. 26). Or stated more positively, there is a recognition that "the deep significance of the task of the school administrator is to be found in the pedagogic ground of its vocation" (Evans, 1991, p. 17), that a key to reculturing is changing the taproot of the profession from management to education. The educator metaphor legitimates Bill Greenfield's (1995) proposition that "although numerous sources might be cultivated, norms rooted in the ethos and culture of teaching as a profession provide the most effective basis for leadership in a school" (p. 75). It infuses what Evans (1998) nicely describes as the "pedagogic motive" (p. 41) into the lifeblood of school leadership. It repositions leading from management to learning (Institute for Educational Leadership 2000). It requires, as Rowan (1995) has recorded, that leaders be "pioneers in the development and management of new forms of instructional practice in schools, and [that] they...[develop] a thorough understanding of the rapidly evolving body of research on learning and teaching that motivate these new practices" (p. 116). Because the challenge for educational leaders will be "to refocus the structure [of schooling] on some new conception of teaching and learning" (Elmore, 1990, p. 63), they will need to be more broadly educated in general and much more knowledgeable about the core technology of education in particular. "Instructional and curricular leadership must be at the forefront of leadership skills" (Hallinger, 1990, p. 77). In a rather dramatic shift from earlier times, school and district administrators will be asked to exercise intellectual leadership not as head teachers, but as head learners.

Community Builder

The job of the administrator as community builder unfolds in three distinct but related dimensions (Murphy, Beck, Crawford, Hodges & McGoughy, 2001). The first venue is with parents and members of the school environment. Here the role of the administrator is to nurture the development of open systems where access and voice are honored. On a second level, the struggle is to foster the evolution of "communities of learning" (Zeichner & Tabachnich, 1991, p. 9) among professional staff. Finally, an unrelenting focus on the creation of personalized learning environments for youngsters is a central aspect of the community building function of school leaders.

Central to task of community builder are a multitude of new ways of doing business (Beck & Foster, 1999). Leaders need to adopt strategies and styles that are in harmony with the central tenets of the heterarchical school organizations they seek to create. They must learn to lead not from the apex of the organizational pyramid but from a web of interpersonal relationships—with people rather than through them. Their base of influence must be professional expertise and moral imperative rather than line authority. They must learn to lead

by empowering rather than by controlling others. "Such concepts as purposing, working to build a shared covenant" (Sergiovanni, 1989, p. 33), and establishing meaning—rather than directing, controlling, and supervising—are at the core of this type of leadership: Empowering leadership, in turn, is "based on dialogue and cooperative, democratic leadership principles" (Bolin, 1989, p. 86). Enabling leadership also has a softer, less heroic hue. It is more ethereal and less direct: "Symbolic and cultural leadership are key leadership forces" (Sergiovanni, 1989, p. 33). There is as much heart as head in this style of leading. It is grounded more upon modeling and clarifying values and beliefs than upon telling people what to do. Its goals include "ministering" (Sergiovanni, 1991, p. 335) to the needs of organizational members rather than gaining authority over them and creating "new structures that enable the emergence of leadership on a broad basis" (Sykes & Elmore, 1989, p. 79). It is more reflective and self-critical than bureaucratic management.

As community builders, school administrators must encourage "others to be leaders in their own right" (Sergiovanni, 1991, p. 335), they need to stretch leadership across organizational actors and roles (Spillane, Diamond, & Jita, 2000)—to ensure that leadership is deeply distributed (Elmore, 1999). They also need to demonstrate the ethic of care to all members of the larger school community (Beck, 1994).

Summary

In this paper, we assembled the raw material to be used in rebuilding the profession of school administration. We selected the foundations that we did because we concluded that the traditional ways of defining the profession were inadequate to the task of reculturing. We also believe that the work of many colleagues across the full spectrum of the profession exposes the presence of a powerful synthesizing paradigm that can carry us into the future, one that fuses together the three powerful constructs of school improvement, social justice, and democratic community. In concluding, we described three metaphors that correspond to these concepts and that create an alternative platform for thinking about school leadership.

Note

1. This paper is built from two earlier investigations on this topic – Murphy (1992, 1999).

References

Bates, R. J. (1984). Toward a critical practice of educational administration. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. E. Corbally (Eds.), *Leadership and organizational culture: New perspectives on administrative theory and practice* (pp. 260-274). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Beck, L. G. (1994). *Reclaiming educational administration as a caring profession*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Beck, L. G., & Foster, W. (1999). Administration and community: Considering challenges, exploring possibilities. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (2nd ed., pp. 337-358). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Bolin, F. S. (1989, Fall). Empowering leadership. *Teachers College Record, 91*(1), 81-96.

Boyan, N.J. (1981, February). Follow the leader: Commentary on research in educational administration. *Educational Research, 10*(2), 6-13, 21.

Boyd, W. L., & Crowson, R. L. (1981). The changing conception and practice of public school administration. In D. C. Berliner (Ed.), *Review of research in education* (Vol. 9, pp. 311-373). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Bridges, E. M., & Hallinger, P. (1992). *Problem-based learning for administrators*. Eugene: University of Oregon, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Bridges, E. M. & Hallinger, P. (1995). *Implementing problem-based learning in leadership development*. Eugene: University of Oregon, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Campbell, R. F., Fleming, T., Newell, L. J., & Bennion, J. W. (1987). *A history of thought and practice in educational administration*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Elmore, R. F. (1990, September). *Reinventing school leadership* (pp. 62-65) [Working memo prepared for the Reinventing School Leadership Conference]. Cambridge, MA: National Center for Educational Leadership.

Elmore, R. F. (1999, September). *Leadership of large-scale improvement in American education*. Paper prepared for the Albert Shanker Institute.

Erickson, D. A. (1977). An overdue paradigm shift in educational administration, or how can we get that idiot off the freeway. In L. L. Cunningham, W. G. Hack, & R. O. Nystrand (Eds.), *Educational administration: The developing decades* (pp. 114-143). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Erickson, D. A. (1979, March). Research on educational administration: The state-of-the-art-. *Educational Researcher, 8*, 9-14.

Evans, R. (1991, April). *Ministrative insight: Educational administration as pedagogic practice*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Evans, R. (1998, Summer). Do intentions matter? Questioning the text of a high school principal. *Journal of Educational Administration and Foundations, 13*(1), 30-51.

Evers, C. W. & Lakomski, G. (1996a, August). Postpositivist conceptions of science in educational administration: An introduction. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 32*(3), 341-343.

Evers, C. W. & Lakomski, G. (1996b, August). Science in educational administration: A postpositivist conception. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 32*(32), 379-402.

Greenfield, T. B. (1988). The decline and fall of science in educational administration. In D. E. Griffith, R. T. Stout, & P. B Forsyth (Eds.), *Leaders for America's schools* (pp. 131-159). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Greenfield, W. D. (1995, February). Toward a theory of school administration: The centrality of leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 31*(1), 61-85.

Griffiths, D. E. (1988). *Educational administration: Reform PDQ or RIP* (Occasional paper, no 8312). Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.

Griffiths, D. E. (1995). Theoretical pluralism in educational administration. In R. Donmoyer, M. Imber, & J. J. Scheurich (Eds.), *The knowledge base in educational administration: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 300-309). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Griffiths, D. E. (1997, October). The case for theoretical pluralism. *Educational Management & Administration, 25*(4), 371-380.

Hallinger, P. (1990). *Reinventing school leadership* (pp. 75-78) [Working memo prepared for the Reinventing School Leadership Conference]. Cambridge, MA: National Center for Educational Leadership.

Harlow, J. G. (1962). Purpose-defining: The central function of the school administrator. In J. A. Culbertson & S. P. Hencley (Eds.), *Preparing administrators: New perspectives* (pp. 61-71). Columbus, OH: University Council for Educational Administration.

Hoy, W. K. (1996, August). Science and theory in the practice of educational administration: A pragmatic perspective. *Educational Adminsitration quarterly, 32*(3), 366-378.

Institute for Educational Leadership (2000, October). *Leadership for student learning: reinventing the principalship*. Washington, DC: Author

Kliebard, H. M. (1995). *The struggle for the American curriculum 1893-1958* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

March, J. G. (1978, February). American public school administration: A short analysis. *School Review, 86*, 217-250.

Moorman, H. (1990, September). *Reinventing school leadership* (pp. 98-103) [Working memo prepared for the Reinventing School Leadership Conference]. Cambridge, MA: National Center for Educational Leadership.

Murphy, J. (1992). *The landscape of leadership preparation: Reframing the education of school administrators*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J. (1999). *The quest for a center: Notes on the state of the profession of educational administration*. Columbia, MO: University Council for Educational Administration.

Murphy, J., Beck, L. G., Crawford, M., Hodges, A., & McGoughy, C. L. (2001). *The productive high school: Creating personalized academic communities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Osin, L. & Lesgold, A. (1996, Winter). A proposal for the reengineering of the educational system. *Review of Educational Researcy, 66*(4), 621-656.

Powell, A. G., Farrar, E., & Cohen, D. K. (1985). *The shopping mall high school: Winners and losers in the educational marketplace*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Rowan, B. (1995, February). Research on learning and teaching in K-12 school: Implications for the field of educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 31*(1), 115-133.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1989). Value-driven schools: The amoeba theory. In H. J. Walberg & J. J. Lane (Eds.), *Organizing for learning: Toward the 21st century* (pp. 31-40). Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1991). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Spillane, J. P, Diamond, J. B., & Loyiso, J. (2000, April). *Leading classroom instruction: A preliminary exploration of the distribution of leadership practice*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Starratt, R. J. (1991, May). Building an ethical school: A theory for practice in educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 27*(2), 185-202.

Sykes, G., & Elmore, R. F. (1989). Making schools more manageable. In J. Hannaway & R. L. Crowson (Eds.), *The politics of reforming school administrations* (pp. 77-94). New York: Falmer Press.

Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 21*, 1-19.

Willower, D. J. (1998, September). Fighting the fog: A criticism of postmodernism. *Journal of School Leadership, 8*(5), 448-463.

Zeichner, K. M., & Tabachnich, B. R. (1991). Reflections on reflective teaching. In B. R. Tabachnich & K. M Zeichner (Eds.), *Issues and practices in inquiry-oriented teacher education*. London: Falmer Press.